



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

November Minutes

The tenth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, November 6, 2014 in the Oella Room at the Roger Carter Community Center, 3000 Milltowne Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Eileen Tennor; Allan Shad; and Drew Roth

Members absent:

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairman Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Shad moved to Approve the October 2, 2014 minutes. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-08c – 8180 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-28c – 3723 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
3. 14-29c – 3630 Church Road, Ellicott City
4. 14-62c – 8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 14-77 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-78 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-79 – 8374 Court Avenue, Ellicott City
8. 14-80 – 8396 Park Drive, Ellicott City
9. 14-81 – 4472 Ilchester Road, Ellicott City, HO-456
10. 14-82 – 3538 Church Road, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

14-08c – 8180 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Enalee Bounds

Background & Scope of Work: On March 6, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to replace the shutters on the front and side of the building with new wood shutters and repair or replace the rotten trim on the windows and doors on the 1st and 2nd floor. The application states that \$8,600.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$2,150.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credits as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-28c – 3723 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: David Ennis

Background & Scope of Work: On June 5, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to reset the existing granite steps and repoint the garden wall. The application states that \$1,300.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$325.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-29c – 3630 Church Road, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Gary Segal

Background & Scope of Work: On June 5, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to repair the damaged slate roof and flashing. The application states that \$3,105.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$776.25 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-62c – 8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: William and Brenda Franz

Background & Scope of Work: On September 4, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to prep and paint

the exterior of the building. During painting, it was discovered there was some rotten wood on the building, which needed to be replaced in order to finish painting. The application states that \$2,120.00 was spent on the work. The Applicant seeks \$530.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The rotten wood was not specifically anticipated in the original tax credit pre-approval. However, Staff finds the replacement of the rotten wood to fall under 'prep work' as rotten wood cannot be painted.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credit as submitted, to include the replacement of the rotten wood.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-77 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City

Roof repair, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Len Berkowitz

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to repair and resurface the existing metal roof with a weather barrier and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The roof will be cleaned, bolts and screws will be tightened and repaired with roof caulking as needed to create a watertight seal. An acrylic roof coating will be applied to the entire roof. The coating will prevent leaks in the roof and reflect the sun's UV rays, keeping the roof cool. Finally, a roof primer will be applied to the entire roof to complete the work.

Staff Comments: The roof has been coated in the past and requires re-coating now. The metal roof is not visible from the public right of way. The white roof complies with Chapter 6.E (page 31), which states, "generally strong colors should be avoided for visible roofing materials...Neutral grays allow a much wider selection of colors on the lower parts of the building." The Guidelines do not specifically reference maintenance of metal roofs. However, Staff finds the proposed work to be routine maintenance of the metal roof. The work is eligible for tax credits, per Section 20.112 of the County Code, which defines eligible work as, "Work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-78 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Mark Bean

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890, although it most likely dates to the mid to late 1920s as the original Patapsco Hotel collapsed and was demolished, then

rebuilt. The Applicant proposes to clean, prep, and repaint the window lintel white to match the existing. The Applicant also proposes to paint the cornice a dark green, to match a neighboring cornice a few buildings over.

Staff Comments: The application explains that the cornice will be painted green across two other properties, in addition to this property. Those buildings will also need to submit an application for Certificate of Approval to paint a new color. However, Staff finds that using the same color will bring consistency to the block. The proposed painting of the window lintels and cornice complies with Chapter 6.N (page 6.N) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible.” While the green doesn’t completely match the storefront colors, it is not common to view the entire building and the cornice will also be viewed adjacent to the neighboring cornices.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: There are currently no funds remaining in this grant cycle. In the event that funding opens up (if another project falls through), approval will be based on availability of funds, approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-79 – 8374 Court Avenue, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations/new construction.

Applicant: David Barber

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the main historic house dates to 1897. The Applicant proposes to demolish and replace the existing garage, which was constructed in the 1960s. The Applicant received approval to demolish the garage and construct a new garage in June 2014 in case HDC-14-36. However after some issues arose when the Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits reviewed the building plans, the Applicant has decided to modify the new building. The Applicant proposes to use the same materials as approved in June 2014, with the only modification being a Boral poly ash siding in place of HardiePlank. The Boral poly ash siding is “comprised of coal combustion products (fly ash) and a proprietary polymer blend, and boasts a high level of sustainability with a minimum of 70 percent recycled content. Suitable for ground contact, Boral TruExterior™ Siding is highly resistant to moisture and can be installed using traditional woodworking tools and methods and there is no need for back priming, or to prime or seal end cuts” (Boralamerica.com).

The garage will remain very similar to the original submittal; it will have a hipped roof, will be painted to match the historic home and use the same roof shingles as the historic home. The garage doors will be a 12 foot roll up door and one sliding barn style door. There will be brass or copper exterior sconces placed at the door locations and these will be the same as previously submitted.

The new garage will be a one story structure, and will no longer have any usable space in the basement level. There will be one 2:2 window on the south elevation. The south elevation will also have a visible stone foundation line. The west elevation will only consist of siding and the stone foundation. The north elevation will contain two separate roll up garage doors. The east elevation will have one sliding barn door in the center and an entry door on the left.

Staff Comments: This application is very similar to the one approved in June 2014. The construction of the new garage complies with Chapter 7.C (page 55) recommendations, such as “if allowed by the size and shape of the property, place new outbuildings to the side or rear of the main building, separated from the main building by a substantial setback” and “design outbuildings visible from a public way to be compatible in scale, form and detailing with historic structures and outbuildings in the neighborhood.” The materials will all be the same as previously approved, which comply with the Guidelines. The only possible change in material is from a HardiePlank to the Boral poly ash siding. Staff finds the Boral ash siding is very similar to the HardiePlank, and finds that it complies with Chapter 7.C (page 55) recommendations, “use materials compatible with the main building on the lot or with historic outbuildings in the immediate neighborhood.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in David Barber. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Barber stated all information which was previously submitted will remain ‘as is’, except there will only be one level instead of two. Mr. Barber would like to have the Boral siding approved as an option to use and explained they have still not decided if they want to use HardiePlank or the Boral lap siding. Mr. Shad asked if the type of Boral lap siding been selected yet. Mr. Barber stated no selection was made, but the intent is to match the German lap siding currently on the house. Mr. Shad stated the Dutch lap siding would be best. The siding which best matches the German lap siding will be chosen. Ms. Tennor asked about the stone foundation. Mr. Barber stated any exposed area as was stated in the original design will be clad in stone.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations, giving the Applicant the option to use the previously approved siding or the new Boral siding in the Dutch lap. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-80 – 8396 Park Drive, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Tarpley M. Long

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1899. The application indicates the Applicant and architect think the house more likely dates to 1930s, which based on the historic use of this land, seems more accurate. The Applicant proposes to make the following exterior alterations and repairs:

- 1) Remove existing pressure treated deck on back of house and add screened porch/deck. The new decking material will be a silver/gray Azek. The deck will have a cable railing. Ceiling fans will be added inside the screened porch and will be an aged bronze color. The screened porch will have decorative wooden balusters.
- 2) Replace two vinyl windows on the front of the house and replace with wood windows and paint cream to match existing.
- 3) Replace front doors and side door and paint cream to match existing color.
- 4) Replace the current brown asphalt shingle roof with a gray asphalt shingle roof.
- 5) Replace asphalt shingles from garage roof and replace with ‘Rustic Red’ metal roof.

- 6) Remove skylights on front of house and add three skylights to the back of the house.
- 7) Add 2:2 casement window to the second floor side of the house next to the chimney.
- 8) Add wall mount bronze can lights to the screened porch.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for painting the windows and doors, replacing the roof, and the construction of the screened-in porch for the porch balusters, porch and deck foundation, post and beam construction.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6 recommendations for the Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings. The removal of the pressure treated deck and replacement with a new screened-in porch and deck is consistent with Chapter 7.B (page 54) recommendations, “design new porches and decks to be simple, compatible in design with the existing building and in scale with the existing building in size and roof height.” The porch and deck will remain on the rear of the building, which Chapter 7 recommends, “decks should not be added to a historic building’s primary façade or a façade highly visible from a public way.” The Applicant proposes to use Azek as the material for the new porch decking, with wood and cable railings on the deck. While the Guidelines recommend using stained or painted wood, the porch and deck will not be highly visible from the road. Chapter 7.B recommends, “on historic buildings, construct porches of painted wood rather than poured concrete, metal or unpainted wood. Use stained or unpainted wood only for less visible features of a new porch, such as the decking and step treads, or for simple decks (with railings but no walls or roof) on the rear of the building in a location not facing or highly visible from a public way.” Azek decking has been previously approved for use in the historic districts and Staff finds it will resemble painted wood. The lighting fixtures comply with Chapter 9.E recommendations, “choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material” and “place attached lighting fixtures in traditional locations next to or over a door.” The lights will be bronze, a dark metal and located near doors in the screened porch area. The ceiling fans are not referenced in the Guidelines, but will be located within the screened porch and is a common feature on porches. Staff has no objection to the ceiling fans.

The screened porch will have decorative wooden balusters. The deck will have traditional deck railings, with metal cable. While the metal cable is modern, it will also not be highly visible from a distance, so if there is any visibility from the public right-of-way, only wood will be visible.

The replacement of the vinyl windows with wood windows complies with Chapter 6.H (page 40) recommendations, “replace inappropriate modern windows with windows of appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original windows is available, choose new windows similar to the original. Otherwise, select windows appropriate to the period and style of the building.” The replacement of the doors is also consistent with Chapter 6.G (page 37) recommendations, “replace inappropriate modern doors with doors of an appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original door is available, choose a new door similar to the original. Otherwise, use a door appropriate to the period and style of the building.”

The replacement of the brown asphalt shingle roof with a gray asphalt shingle roof complies with Chapter 6.E (page 31), which states, “Colorful roofs draw attention away from the more important building features. Neutral grays allow a much wider selection of colors on the lower parts of the building.” The removal of the skylights on the front of the building and the addition of skylights on the rear of the building also complies with Chapter 6.E (page 32) recommendations, “add skylights or roof vents only on roof surfaces not visible from a public way.” The Applicant also proposes to replace the asphalt shingles from the garage roof and replace it with a metal roof, in the color ‘Rustic Red’. The roof is not highly visible from the street as there is a very low pitch on the roof. The color of the roof will be compatible with the color of the siding.

The removal of the deck and addition of the new screened porch and deck is not eligible for tax credits, per Section 20.112 of the County Code as it is new construction. However, the replacement of the roof, replacement windows and doors (not to include the skylights or new casement window), and the painting of the doors and windows are eligible for the tax credit.

The Applicant has also stated in an email to Staff that there are structural issues with the foundation. The contractor has provided the following description of the problem, "The reason for the structural repair is the geo pressure (side pressure) being applied to this side of your home. Due to the construction technique that was available when your home was originally built, you have hollow core masonry units. Over time, this sideward pressure has created a deterioration including cracks and bulging to this side wall." The Applicant's architect has explained that the structural engineer is proposing, "to reinforce the existing exterior basement wall with a new concrete wall next to it on the inside, with new interior footings. This work will be accessed through the existing garage. It is not underpinning." The architect has also explained there will be no exterior work or excavation work; the exterior of the house will not be disturbed by this repair. This work is eligible for tax credits as explained in Section 20.112 of the County Code, which states that eligible work includes, "work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for all items except the removal of the deck and the construction of the new screened porch and deck and related items. Ms. Holmes amended the recommendations to include the skylights and new casement window as not being eligible for tax credits.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Tarpley Long. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Long stated she received an email regarding the garage roof, from the contractor who will be doing the house restoration. The contractor stated even though metal was initially recommended to be used for the garage roof, he said it may be possible to now use asphalt roofing on the garage, which would then be the same material that will be used on the main house. Ms. Long wanted to use the same roofing material on both the house and the garage to make them uniform. Landmark Certaineed Cobblestone Grey will be used. Ms. Holmes asked if the pitch of the roof will be changed. Ms. Long stated there was concern about the roof pitch and if leaks would occur with asphalt shingle, but according to the contractor there should be no problem and no change in pitch will be needed. There is a steeper pitch on the back of the roof that should help with drainage.

Ms. Tennor wanted to clarify the two elevation drawings, one drawing had a porch and the other drawing did not have a porch. Ms. Long explained that one is an interior elevation and the other is the screening of the porch. Ms. Tennor asked if any changes would be done to the elevations surrounding the house. Ms. Long said that only the deck is being removed and replaced with a new deck. Mr. Shad had no questions, but did have a concern about the back porch addition and the way the roof slopes into the other roof. He said it is one level and does not appear to be draining in one direction or another. Ms. Long stated there will be a 'cricket' on the roof.

Mr. Hauser asked about the colors of the new house. Ms. Long stated the colors will be kept the same. Mr. Hauser asked if the screened porch will have the same color. Ms. Long stated the porch will be the same color as the springhouse. The gray roof will help unite both the porch and the springhouse.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted, with the modification of the roof material on the garage to be the same as the roofing on the house. In addition, the skylights and new casement window are not eligible for tax credits. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-81 – 4472 Ilchester Road, Ellicott City, HO-456

Advisory Comments for Subdivision

Applicant: Stephanie Tuite

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1866. The house is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-456, the Fislage-Cavey House. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 8.19 acre property into 10 total lots. There will be 6 new buildable lots, with the barn to be saved on a 7th buildable lot and the historic house on a 9th buildable lot. Open space will be located on two lots. This project originally came before the Commission in September 2013 for Advisory Comments. At that time, the project only consisted of 6 new buildable lots, a lot for the historic house and two open space lots. The Applicant has since reduced the number of lots of the east side of the property from three lots to two lots, but overall increased the number of buildable lots by retaining the barn on one lot and adding two new lots.

Lots 1 and 2 have been created since this plan was first presented to the Commission, through zoning variances. The barn, which was previously proposed to be demolished, will remain on Lot 4 and be renovated to become a habitable structure.

Staff Comments: The two lots on the east side of the property will be larger lots than when three lots were proposed. However, reducing to two lots will not provide any additional setback or buffering from the neighboring property at 4450 Ilchester Road. A grove of spruces and white pines will be removed for Lot 8 to be constructed. If possible, Staff recommends shifting these two lots over in a north and south alignment rotating both lots 45 degrees clockwise to allow Lot 8 to become more of the buffer and open space area. This would allow the new houses more of a buffer from the adjacent property. A structure built on Lot 8 would sit about 24 feet higher than the neighboring property. Additional open space would also allow for more room for storm water management so that the storm water does not flow directly into the neighboring property. Native evergreen trees would provide a good screen between the two properties.

Staff originally recommended the barn be retained and reused, but if that was not desired by the Applicant, that it should be deconstructed and the material sent to a salvage store. While Staff is glad to see the barn is to remain, Staff is concerned of the practical use of the barn and the stone retaining wall removal. Staff recommends Lot 4 and 5 be combined so that there is room for an addition to be constructed on the barn, if desired, to make a larger building footprint.

Staff recommendation: Staff recommends rotating Lot 7 and 8 to preserve the existing evergreen buffer, and creating more open space between the subject property and the neighboring property. Staff also recommends a native evergreen buffer be planted between the two properties. Staff is concerned of the practical use of the barn being converted into a house on a small lot and with Lot 5 behind it.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser stated that this case is for advisory comments only. Mr. Hauser swore in Stephanie Tuite and Eva Nelson. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Tuite stated a meeting was held last year with representatives from DPZ [Marsha McLaughlin, Kent Sheubrooks, Beth Burgess and Samantha Holmes] to discuss the options for changing the layout and to incorporate some of the recommendations given by the Commission and Staff at the September 2013 HPC meeting. Ms. Tuite explained that one of the suggestions was to obtain a variance to shift the lots in order to have a more usable, buildable area in the steep slope area on the south side of the property. The variance was approved; another community meeting was held; and a new plan was submitted to DPZ Staff for this current meeting. The Applicant met with Staff just prior to the November 6th HPC meeting and there were some minor changes to the plan, which resulted in the updated plan

which the Commission has. The houses on Lots 7 and 8 have been re-oriented, rather than the lot shape, which gives more distance between the house on Lot 8 and the adjacent property's house. Lot 8 sits on a berm and the plan was to cut the berm down as it was man-made, which would give a more level lot and decrease some of the steep slopes on the property. The lots on the other side have been slightly shifted in order to keep the existing driveway as is and widen the driveway to the required 16 feet. There may need to be some altering over time with the drive to gain more front yard for Lot 3. The other main change is the driveway for Lot 3 will be shifted and a portion of the barn will need to be removed in order to put the driveway over to the property line.

Mr. Hauser has concerns about someone purchasing Lot 2 to live on and having traffic from Lot 3 and Lot 5 being close to their home. Mr. Hauser asked what the reasoning was for the existing driveway location. Ms. Tuite stated some of the reasoning is because of the slope of the road. This section of Ilchester Road before and after the bend in the road is pretty steep, so the further down the road becomes steeper; coming off of the current angle allows more distance to level out the slope. The decision was to keep this section of driveway and shift other items around. Mr. Hauser asked about the retention of trees along Ilchester Road. Ms. Tuite said the plan is to retain the majority of the existing trees, except for where the driveway realignment will occur down on the lower side. There will only be one tree along the property frontage which will need to be removed. Mr. Hauser asked about the drainage. Ms. Tuite stated most drainage comes from the ridge line around the area of the barn and existing house, and mainly drains down Ilchester Road. The drainage will remain in the same pattern as it is now and that the installation of dry wells or bio-retention will be required.

Ms. Tennor asked if the new alignment is to try and retain the original configuration of the drive and follow the original line. Ms. Tuite said yes, until the older driveway becomes more of a horseshoe shape. One reason for switching it back is partly due to site distance, but the lower portion of the driveway is very steep so the change is to get the drive a bit further up the road to decrease the slope. Ms. Tennor clarified that the other part of the horseshoe is not being retained in order to mitigate the slope. Ms. Tuite stated correct. Ms. Tennor pointed out there is a small awkward strip between two drives and asked if there was a way to relocate the drive going to the barn to improve the relationship of the two drives of Lots 4 and 5. Ms. Tuite stated this was the existing drive, but changing the location is not impossible. Ms. Tennor discussed relocating the driveway for the barn to the rear of the lot. Ms. Tuite stated the intent was to leave the majority of the driveway as it was, but it is possible to tie the two drives together.

Mr. Roth asked if the barn was to be turned into a residence. Ms. Tuite stated yes, that is the intent. Mr. Roth questioned if it would be practical for a person to live there. Ms. Tuite could not speak to the renovation of the barn, which is outside her scope of work. Mr. Roth is concerned that the barn would not be a desirable place to live, with a driveway to Lot 5 behind the barn's lot (lot 4) immediately adjacent to it. Ms. Burgess stated that Lot 5 is a premium lot, and Staff recommended at the meeting last year that Lot 4, containing the barn, be kept. There is also the driveway issue for accessibility. The attempt is being made to accommodate all issues and needs. Ms. Tennor feels that the barn could still be developed, even though the driveway is close. The barn is salvageable and worth saving. Ms. Tennor commented that the driveway could come off the other side of the barn and not have a connection; eliminate the small stub of driveway between the barn and loop road and tie both together. Mr. Roth asked about the issue of the original location of the driveway to Lot 5. Ms. Tuite stated there was a suggestion the drive was too close to the existing structure on Lot 6. Ms. Tuite will look into the suggestion of changing the driveway for the barn. Ms. Tennor stated she previously did not see a reason to have access to the structure on Lot 2 connected by a piece of driveway if there is access to Ilchester Road, as Lot 1 does. She did say that if the road is connecting Lot 5 and Lot 3, it is more of a loop so it does make more sense.

Mr. Hauser asked if there was any public comment on this case. There was none. The Commission had no additional comments.

14-82 – 3538 Church Road, Ellicott City

Advisory Comments for Subdivision.

Applicant: Stephanie Tuite

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the principal building dates to 1937. There are three other structures on the property, including a small cottage house, a shed and a barn. The property is 8.5 acres. This plan was first presented to the Commission for Advisory Comments in April 2013. At that time the plan was to demolish all existing structures on site and create a 15 lot subdivision, with 14 buildable lots and 1 open space lot. That plan called for 9 houses fronting Church Road, with a total of 11 curb cuts on the road to serve flag lots as well. The Commission did not find the site plan in-keeping with the historic district and neighborhood. A later version of the plan had shared driveways to cut back on the curb cuts on to Church Road.

Over the course of several months, the community has met with the engineers and developers to work toward a more appropriate site plan. This is the plan that was submitted for this latest round of Advisory Comments, with some minor engineering changes. The current plan contains 13 buildable lots, with 3 open space lots. There will be one main road, directly across from Deanwood Avenue, that will be a public road in order to handle trash and recycling pickup, in order to keep that function off of Church Road. Lot 6 is the only lot that will have a driveway with access from Church Road, but it is on the northwest side of the site (past Deanwood Avenue, just before Park Drive) and will not be highly noticeable. There will be six houses on Church Road; the rest will be accessed off of shared driveways.

Staff Comments: Staff finds this plan more in keeping with the historic district and that it has addressed several of the community concerns voiced at the last meeting for Advisory Comments. The row of houses lining Church Road is now similar to those found across the street at the Woods of Park Place. Staff recommended the site plan be similar to the Woods of Park Place so that the subdivision reads as one cohesive development.

There is a 75 foot setback shown between Lot 9 and Road A. The setback only needs to be 20 feet from an interior road. Staff recommends reducing the 75 foot setback to a 35 foot setback, shifting the lots with it. That would then provide a setback of 70 feet from the Taylor property line, a neighboring historic residence. If possible, Staff recommends shifting Lot 13 west to provide a greater side setback from the Taylor property line. Staff recommends planting a dense native evergreen buffer along the Taylor/Duffy property line to buffer the historic houses from the new construction.

The Applicant has provided renderings for the future homes. The architecture appears to be compatible with the historic homes in the neighborhood and with The Woods of Park Place subdivision across the street. Staff recommends street trees be planted along Church Road in front of lots 6-11.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends reducing the side setback between Lot 9 and Road A as mentioned above, in order to shift the lots and provide a larger side setback between Lot 11 and the Taylor property line. Staff recommends shifting Lot 13 west to provide a larger setback. Staff recommends planting street trees along Church Road in front of lots 6-11, and planting a native evergreen buffer on the east side of property along the Taylor/Duffy property line.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Don Taylor, from D W Taylor Associates. Stephanie Tuite was already sworn in. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Taylor stated the only comment would relate to the setbacks, but wanted to explain the design process first.

Mr. Taylor explained to the Commission that Gary Maule has been assisting the design team in meeting with the community through a number of charrettes to develop the process on how to get from where this plan was a year and a half ago to now. Mr. Don Taylor said that they are not seeking approval tonight, but seeking advice which will help get to the next step of the best design for this project. He said the process is the development of a regiment to allow the team to take advantage of community input, especially for new construction projects. Mr. Don Taylor asked the Commission to allow Mr. Maule to give a bit of history of the process which has taken place over the past six months. In addition, Mr. Maule has prepared a workbook showing the history of the community design process.

Mr. Hauser swore in Gary Maule of Church Road. Mr. Maule explained his design philosophy, of looking at the whole project, including the outside area. In June, there was a meeting with the community and the plan was presented. Mr. Maule said that there is a process for bringing the community and the design team together to develop consensus and so he offered at the meeting to facilitate some work sessions between the community, the owner, and the builder. The owner and builder agreed to attend the sessions. There were three meetings held, and the concerns of the community were documented and translated into the plan. Mr. Maule explained that this information is part of the workbook, which was handed out to Staff and the Commission. The process was to try and understand the site, understand the concerns of the community, and translate the information into a plan.

Mr. Hauser asked if there was good participation by the community. Mr. Maule stated that community members did show up and participated. He explained that plans and markers were laid out and discussions were held about various alternatives, which brought out concerns from community members. Mr. Maule said that each meeting brought more consensus on the plan. The last phase took recommendations and incorporated into one plan at a larger scale. He said they also did conceptual grading on the plan to see if it would fit the site. The biggest challenge for the site is the hilly terrain. The topography is a bowl-shaped piece of property which can be developed around the perimeter. There is a stream preservation area in the center of the site. Mr. Maule explained that the original plan shows about half of the site in open space. One of the concerns is if the open space does not reach Church Road, then the community cannot have access and participate in it. The open space goes into a development pod, which brings the park into the development. Besides the open space, the area needs to look like one community and to be compatible with Church Road. Mr. Maule spoke about other areas which could have open space to create a buffer and preserve the roadway. His suggestion was to keep areas of open space and make the lots smaller, not bigger. Mr. Maule asked the Commission to take the workbook and study it, in relation to the plan that was submitted.

Mr. Don Taylor stated the information presented by Mr. Maule was taken to a technical level and applied some of the zoning and engineering standards which are required on the site. The plan which was submitted for this meeting contains this information. The grading on the site was analyzed, which did impact the architecture being proposed. Some rough floor plans have been drafted which are designed to accommodate the site.

Ms. Tennor commented that the units will be focused inward and on Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 the rear of the house will be closest to Church Road but there will be buffered area behind the lots. Mr. Don Taylor stated correct. Ms. Tennor stated there are other developments in the County with the units focused inward, but there are some where there is an open end rear view of the units. She asked if it was possible to handle rear yards with covenants so that there would not be outbuildings or storage sheds between the houses and Church Road, which may defeat the buffering along the road. Mr. Don Taylor agreed, and said that it is planned to have covenants in order to maintain the site as a natural setting. He said the other goal is to extend the architecture to all four sides and not just the traditional façade look. There is no reason why the design quality could not be extended to the sides and rear with symmetry that makes sense; it just takes a little more effort.

Mr. Hauser asked if there were any public who would like to make comments on this application.

Mr. Hauser swore in John Russell. Mr. Russell is the Vice-President of the Woods of Park Place HOA. Mr. Russell stated there is an improvement in the design and layout of this plan. He said that lots 9, 10 and 11 face Church Road and are grouped too close together. Mr. Russell said these lots do not match the Woods of Park Place housing. He finds there is too much of a clustered look. He said there are six homes on the front of Church Road, and the front of the homes should face Church Road, with porches. The front yards should face Church Road as would be traditional. Mr. Russell said on the west side of the entrance road down towards Park Drive there is a grouping of mature healthy trees, and would like to see the majority of those trees retained. Mr. Russell pointed out on the east side of the entrance road, there are three homes with the smallest lots. He also stated that there are traffic issues which will occur with 13 new homes and 26 additional vehicles. The road already has issues with cars, buses and other vehicles.

Mr. Hauser swore in Todd Taylor. Mr. Todd Taylor commented that mostly what has been talked about is land use issues and very little architectural issues. Mr. Todd Taylor stated that he is not familiar with land use issues and has not had the benefit of being able to review the information which has been submitted, Mr. Todd Taylor requested that the 'record' be kept open in order to review the materials and to submit comments. Mr. Hauser responded that these are only advisory comments and no decision is being made. The purpose is for the Commission to hear the direction of the developer, to hear comments from the public, and to offer comments to the Applicant. This application will be coming back. After a short discussion for legal advice, Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Todd Taylor about his experience with the process, as far as being contacted or going to meetings. Mr. Todd Taylor stated there were some neighbors who were not contacted as they were out of state, but the Applicant did have the information for contacting them. He said that no one else has seen the latest plan and information. At the meetings, the Applicant has not agreed that the proposal is what the actual submission will be. There was a lot of back and forth discussion and the neighborhood was not agreeable to the proposal. Mr. Todd Taylor said that he has not heard anything tonight from the Applicant as to whether they will accept the Staff recommendations and what their position is on the recommendations. Mr. Todd Taylor said that Staff did an excellent job evaluating the proposal, but the plan is not at the final decision yet. If the Applicant would be willing to accept the Staff recommendations, Mr. Taylor will waive the request for keeping the record open.

Mr. Hauser commented that Mr. Taylor would have time to input his comments, but the comments that were made tonight can be addressed with the Commission's comments. Ms. Holmes clarified for the Commission that the packet which Mr. Maule handed out is the process which the community worked through, and the plan being discussed is the large plan submitted by Stephanie Tuite.

Mr. Hauser feels this plan is better than the first plan that was submitted. There are some areas which need work and the Staff comments need to be addressed.

Ms. Tennor stated that the driveway from Lot 6 to Church Road is unobtrusive, and one driveway and a shared access road is a vast improvement over the numerous driveways which were originally submitted, but in looking at the plan, found that it makes Lot 6 appear to not be part of the cluster of homes.

There was a question about the trees which are indicated on the plan for varying degrees and liability. Ms. Tuite stated this is based on the environmental consultant's assessment of the condition of the trees. Ms. Tennor clarified that some of the trees are being removed due to their condition and other good trees are being removed because of their location where homes will be built. Ms. Tuite stated yes,

that is correct.

Ms. Tennor asked if Lots 1, 2 and 3 can be created despite the grading issues. Ms. Tuite said they should not be a problem. Ms. Tennor asked if any noticeable change in paving will be done to the extension of Deanwood Avenue. Ms. Tuite stated the road will be asphalt like the private and common driveways. Ms. Tennor asked about a small strip shown on the plan next to the roadway with a green strip in-between. Ms. Tuite stated this will be a sidewalk, and will be the only one. Ms. Tennor asked about the recommendation for buffer planting. Ms. Tuite stated the intent on the side next to Mr. Todd Taylor is to do a gradual berm with landscaping. Ms. Tennor asked if the trees in poor condition will be replaced. Ms. Tuite stated on Church Road there are 3 trees of the 7 total in bad condition. Mr. Don Taylor stated there will be an opportunity to do replanting of trees and there were discussions about replanting with the Maple trees to keep the same rhythm.

Ms. Tennor commented there is a lot of validity in making smaller lots with large buffer areas, and asked the reason for wanting a large buffer area between Lot 9 and Deanwood Road. A comment was made that the lots are smaller than the lots across Church Road and the clustering of the houses is very noticeable. Ms. Tennor asked if it be possible to expand the space between Lots 9, 10 and 11. Mr. Don Taylor stated the premise for the configuration is based on comments that there is connectivity of the open space to Deanwood Road and Church Road. There is a purpose for the open space to bring it up to Church Road. The open space could possibly be reduced and still retain the effectiveness. The houses are oriented based on how they are approached, the topography and how the houses best function on the site.

Mr. Hauser said the theme of Church Road was large houses setback on big lots. This was an issue for the community when the Woods at Park Place was built. Mr. Hauser said that the Woods at Park Place has smaller lots than the historic homes and questioned whether this new development across from it be allowed to also have smaller lots. At the previous meeting, the Commission requested that the plan not have so many lots. Mr. Don Taylor pointed out that the current plan has one less lot than before. This was done to allow manipulation on the lots and he feels the houses do fit comfortably. The proposed houses are also roughly the same square footage as the Deanwood houses. The goal is to create a community as a terminus of Church Road. The community will fit with Deanwood over time; the character of the houses, the materials and textures will be somewhat similar.

Mr. Shad stated that he has the same concerns about the density and how it compares to the Woods at Park Place. He asked about the density comparison between this development and across the road at Woods of Park Place. Ms. Tuite does not know the comparison. Mr. Hauser swore in Gary Segal of Church Road. Mr. Segal stated the Woods at Park Place ended up with 5 ½ buildable acres and 15 lots. Mr. Hauser commented the density would be roughly the same if looking at the space in between, but these houses are closer together so it does not appear to be. Mr. Shad asked when construction would start. Ms. Tuite stated there are still multiple steps before getting to the construction phase; it could be approximately 1 ½ years to the point of site development plan stage. Mr. Shad commented there is another project in Ellicott City which is on hold due to school capacity, which is another limitation that may affect this project. Mr. Shad also has concerns with the traffic and the impact on Church Road and the historic district.

Mr. Roth stated that keeping the natural contour of the land keeps the historic character, and encouraged the Applicant to present the topography of the land as part of the information to the Commission and inquired about what the topography will be when the land is developed. Mr. Roth asked what is the actual elevation of houses relative to the street and how will the land be re-graded to accomplish the elevation. Mr. Don Taylor stated the elevation has been considered but the details are not worked out yet. The houses will sit lower than the street and are consistent with the houses across

the street at Woods of Park Place. Mr. Don Taylor said the houses will sit about 6 to 8 feet below street level. Mr. Roth stated that he would like to see an actual rendering presented of what this will look like with the actual elevation of the house relative to the street and the contour of the land.

Mr. Hauser stated the density is not correct for Church Road. He said there should be fewer lots, which would allow for more separation between Lots 6, 7 and 8 and Lots 9, 10 and 11 which would make the lot sizing and spacing comparable to Deanwood. Mr. Hauser finds the overall proposal is much better than the previous one and that the idea is good. He said that once the houses come in for review, they will be reviewed to make sure the feel of the area stays the same with the architecture. Mr. Hauser agrees with Mr. Roth that the topography should not be altered much with the building. The runoff/retention needs to be reviewed and there should be retention areas. Mr. Hauser finds the driveway at Lot 6 makes the home appear separate from the community. He said that all the houses should look like they are facing Church Road. Mr. Hauser is not as concerned about the houses on Lots 2, 3 and 4, as they will be architecturally considered on all four sides. Mr. Hauser said that replanting should be done along Church Road to maintain the green look and that consideration needs to be given to the size of trees to be replanted.

Lewis Taylor asked Mr. Hauser if the Commission endorses the Staff comments. Mr. Hauser asked each member to give their feedback. Ms. Holmes made a comment that Staff finds that architectural plans A, B and C to be fairly comparable, but does not find plan D to be architecturally in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood and district based on the stone facing.

Ms. Tennor said there should be a diversity of plantings with a mix of understory. Mr. Roth commented on the houses clustered close together and said this makes them look like an island, depending on how the grading and contour of the land ends up. Given the nature of the area, a park-like open environment may be a better choice.

Mr. Hauser asked the Applicant to speak about the spacing of the houses on Church Road, especially Lot 9. He asked if consideration could be given to moving Lot 9 to allow spacing between 9 and 10. Mr. Don Taylor stated, in reference to Mr. Roth's comment, there is a grade change where the entrance road comes in and drops significantly to the east, which is why one of the houses is located where it is due to the grade change. The other point is the open connection, and the goal is to have it retained. Mr. Roth stated the open connection is a nice idea, but asked if the open connection will happen given the contours of the land and the grading. He questioned if the open connection is an achievable goal.

Mr. Hauser stated when the plan comes back there should also be some contour views. Mr. Don Taylor said more detailed topo can be submitted, along with more accurate house positioning to address the comments on where and how the houses face. The open space will also be reviewed. Mr. Hauser also advised to keep the communication open with the community, Gary Segal and Todd Taylor. Mr. Don Taylor stated they are open to another community meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Staff requested to have the January meeting canceled as the County will be closed over the Christmas/New Year holiday, and there will be no time to produce staff reports or mail them out. The Commission was in agreement to cancel the January meeting.

Staff stated Mr. Hauser is to be relieved of his duties as Chair, as stipulated by procedure, and to nominate a new Chair. A Vice-Chair and Secretary also need to be nominated. Mr. Hauser nominated Ms. Tennor for Chair. Mr. Shad is nominated for Vice-Chair. Mr. Roth is nominated for Secretary. All the

parties agreed to accept the positions.

Mr. Hauser moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary